

DEC 02 2005

## FAX COVER SHEET

Hewlett-Packard Co.  
Legal Department  
11311 Chinden Blvd.  
Boise, ID 83714

PAGES: Number of Pages INCLUDING this cover sheet: 31

FROM: Chris Guthrie  
Phone: (208) 396-4772  
Fax no. (208) 396-3958

TO: MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS  
Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA  
Fax: (571) 273-8300

REF: Application No. 09/874,479  
Attorney Docket no. 10007656-1

## Attached for filing:

- |    |  |                       |
|----|--|-----------------------|
| 2) | Transmittal Letter of Appeal Brief<br><i>Includes certification of facsimile transmission<br/>and authorization to charge deposit account.</i> | (1 page in duplicate) |
| 3) | Appeal Brief   | ( 28 pages)           |

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DEC 02 2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

## PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10007656 -1IN THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Shell S. Simpson et al

Confirmation No.: 5359

Application No.: 09/874479

Examiner: Duong, Qanh

Filing Date: Jun 04, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2155

Title: System And Method For Providing Links To Available Services Over A Network

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner For Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEFTransmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on Nov. 3, 2005.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:☐ 1st Month  
\$120☐ 2nd Month  
\$450☐ 3rd Month  
\$1020☐ 4th Month  
\$1590☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of \$ 500 . At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300.

Date of facsimile: 12/2/05

Typed Name: Chris Guthrie

Signature: Chris Guthrie

Respectfully submitted,

Shell S. Simpson et al

By Nathan Rieth

Nathan Rieth

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No.: 44302

Date: 12/1/05

Telephone: 208 396 5287

DEC 02 2005

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In Re Application of:

Simpson, et al.

Group Art Unit: 2155

Serial No.: 09/874,479

Examiner: Duong, Oanh

Filed: June 4, 2001

Docket No. 10007656-1

For: **System and Method for Providing Links to Available Services Over A  
Network****APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37**Mail Stop: Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed November 3, 2005, responding to the Final Office Action mailed June 3, 2005.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees are required to consider this Appeal Brief. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Docket no. 10007656-1

1

Appln. No. 09/874479

### **I. Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

### **II. Related Appeals and Interferences**

There are no known related appeals or interferences that will affect or be affected by a decision in this Appeal.

### **III. Status of Claims**

Claims 27-51 stand finally rejected. No claims have been allowed. The final rejections of claims 27-51 are appealed.

### **IV. Status of Amendments**

This application was originally filed on June 4, 2001, with twenty-six (26) claims. In a Response filed January 21, 2005, Applicant canceled claims 1-26 and added claims 27-51.

All of the above-identified amendments have been entered and no other amendments have been made to any of claims 27-51. The claims in the attached Claims Appendix (see below) reflect the present state of those claims.

### **V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The claimed inventions are summarized below with reference numerals and references to the written description ("specification") and drawings. The subject matter described in the following appears in the original disclosure at least where indicated, and may further appear in other places within the original disclosure.

Independent claim 27 describes a method for providing links to services that are available on a local network. Applicant's specification, page 2, lines 9-13; page 13, line 25 through page 14, line 27; Figure 6.

The method of claim 27 comprises receiving a request for web content. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 12-19; page 9, lines 20-27; page 11, lines 4-12; page 13, line 25 through page 14, line 4; Figure 6, item 202. The method of claim 27 further comprises querying the local network for information about a current environment. Applicant's specification, page 11, lines 4-12; page 14, lines 2-4; Figure 6, item 204. The method of claim 27 further comprises checking for services that are available on the local network. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 12-19; page 11, lines 4-12; page 14, lines 4-12; Figure 6, items 206-216. The method of claim 27 further comprises creating web content for a network browser, the web content including at least one link to a service that is available on the local network. Applicant's specification, page 11, lines 4-12; page 12, lines 3-10; page 14, lines 12-18; Figure 6, item 218.

Independent claim 35 describes a system stored on a computer-readable medium. Applicant's specification, page 7, line 24 through page 8, line 19; Figure 1, item 10. The

system of claim 35 comprises logic configured to query the local network for information about a current environment. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 12-19; page 11, lines 4-12; page 14, lines 2-6; Figure 1, item 24. The system of claim 35 further comprises logic configured to check for services that are available on the local network. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 12-19; page 11, lines 4-6; page 14, lines 8-11; Figure 1, item 24. The system of claim 35 further comprises logic configured to create web content for a network browser, the web content including at least one link to a service that is available on the local network. Applicant's specification, page 11, lines 4-12; page 12, lines 3-10; page 14, lines 12-18; Figure 1, item 24.

Independent claim 41 describes a computer comprising a network browser that is configured to receive network content. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 8-19; page 11, lines 10-12; Figures 1-5, items 22, 60, 90, 136. The computer of claim 41 further comprises a personal imaging repository that is configured to store imaging data. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 8-23; page 9, lines 12-27; Figures 1-5, items 26, 62, 92, 176. The computer of claim 41 further comprises a thin portal service that is configured to query a local network to which the computer is connected for information about a current environment, to check for imaging services that are available on the local network and that are configured to access the imaging data of the personal imaging repository, and to create web content for the network browser, the web content including at least one link to an imaging service that is available on the local network. Applicant's specification, page 8, lines 5-19; page 11, lines 1-8; Figures 1-5, items 24, 64, 102, 130, 182.

Independent claim 50 describes a system provided on a local network, comprising a computer connected to the local network, the computer including a network browser that is configured to receive network content, and a personal imaging repository that is configured to store imaging data. Applicant's specification, page 13, lines 3-11; Figure 5, items 162, 184, 22, 176, 190, 192. The system of claim 50 further comprises a server connected to the local network, the server including a thin portal service that is configured to check for imaging services that are available on the local network and that are configured to access the imaging data of the personal imaging repository, and to create web content for the network browser, the web content including at least one link to an imaging service that is available on the local network. Applicant's specification, page 13, line 12 through page 14, line 18; Figure 5, items 182, 186, 176, 190, 192.

Independent claim 51 describes a system provided on a local network, comprising a computer connected to the local network, the computer including a network browser that is configured to receive network content. Applicant's specification, page 13, lines 3-11; Figure 5, items 162, 184, 22, 190, 192. The system of claim 51 further comprises a storage server connected to the local network, the storage server including a personal imaging repository that is configured to store imaging data. Applicant's specification, page 13, lines 12-24; Figure 5, items 194, 184, 176, 190, 192. The system of claim 51 further comprises a thin portal server connected to the local network, the thin portal server including a thin portal service that is configured to check for imaging services that are available on the local network and that are configured to access the imaging data of the personal imaging repository, and to create web content for the network browser, the web content including at least one link to an imaging service that is available on the local

network. Applicant's specification, page 13, line 12 through page 14, line 18; Figure 5, items 182, 186, 176, 190, 192.

#### **VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The following grounds of rejection are to be reviewed on appeal:

1. Claims 27-31, 33, 35-37, and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr., et al. ("Martin", U.S. Pat. No. 6,610,105) in view of Rappaport (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0007285).

2. Claims 32, 34, 38, and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Rappaport in further view of Corwin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0075812).

3. Claims 41-51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frigon (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0103813) in view of Smith (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0006911).

#### **VII. Arguments**

The Appellant respectfully submits that Applicant's claims are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, and respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals overturn the final rejections of those claims at least for the reasons discussed below.



# I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As has been acknowledged by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") has the burden under section 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or generally available knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art that would lead that individual to the claimed invention. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) section 2143 discusses the requirements of a *prima facie* case for obviousness. That section provides as follows:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teaching. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

In the present case, the prior art references, when combined, do not teach or suggest all of Applicant's claim limitations. Applicant discusses the applied references and Applicant's claims in the following.

**A. Rejection of Claims 27-31, 33, 35-37, and 39**

Claims 27-31, 33, 35-37, and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr., et al. ("Martin", U.S. Pat. No. 6,610,105) in view of Rappaport (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0007285). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**1. The Martin Disclosure**

Martin discloses a method and system for providing resource access in a mobile environment. Martin, Patent Title.

As is described by Martin, portals have been designed to assist users of mobile devices to navigate the Internet as they do with a desktop computer. Martin, column 2, lines 9-12. However, because the user interface presented on the mobile device display is so different from a user interface that would be presented to the user on a desktop computer screen, the user can become confused as to how to navigate the Internet on the mobile device. Martin, column 2, lines 16-28.

In view of those problems, Martin identifies a need for techniques that provide users with a similar navigation experience on both mobile devices and desktop computers. Martin, column 2, lines 28-31. Martin proposes a system and method that addresses this need in the disclosure contained in columns 4-13. In that disclosure, Martin does not describe any method or system for discovering any services. Instead, Martin's method/system simply provides preselected hyperlinks to a user in a browser.

## 2. The Rappaport Disclosure

Rappaport discloses a method/apparatus/system for providing targeted information in relation to laboratory and other medical services. Rappaport, Patent Application Title. Relied upon in the Office Action to reject Applicant's claims is the following:

[0023] In one embodiment, the database is structured to include a list of codes where each code is used to identify or indicate a particular medical procedure/test. For each code in the list, the database may also contain a list of one or more definitions of the respective code. In one embodiment, the database is used to store a list of data sources identified using the one or more definitions associated with each code. In one embodiment, the database is also configured to store a set of queries associated with each code. The set of queries associated with each code is constructed based upon the one or more definitions corresponding to the respective code. In one embodiment, the list of data sources associated with a particular code is obtained by running the corresponding set of queries against various databases available on the World Wide Web (WWW) to identify one or more documents or content links or services that match the query criteria specified in the corresponding queries. In one embodiment, a selection process is performed to select the list of data sources for the respective code from the documents or content links identified from the various web databases.

[Rappaport, paragraph 0023]

Significantly, this excerpt of the Rappaport disclosure does not identify either of (i) querying a local network for information about its current environment or (ii) checking for services on that local network. No other portion of the Rappaport disclosure is relied upon in rejecting independent claims 27 and 35.

### 3. Applicant's Claims

Applicant claims methods and systems for providing links to services that are available on a local network. For example, independent claim 27 provides as follows (emphasis added):

27. A method for providing links to services that are available on a local network, the method comprising:  
receiving a request for web content;  
*querying the local network for information about a current environment;*  
*checking for services that are available on the local network;* and  
creating web content for a network browser, the web content including at least one link to a service that is available on the local network.

As is noted above, Martin does not describe any method or system for discovering any services. Therefore, the Office Action relies upon the teachings of Rappaport to account for Applicant's limitations of "querying the local network for information about a current environment" and "checking for services that are available on the local network". However, as is mentioned above, Rappaport teaches neither of those limitations.

In regard to the first limitation, i.e., "querying the local network for information about the current environment", paragraph 0023 of the Rappaport disclosure is silent as to querying a "local network" for any information regarding its "current environment". The Martin/Rappaport combination fails to render obvious claim 27 for at least this reason.

In regard to the second limitation, i.e., "checking for services that are available on the local network", paragraph 0023 of the Rappaport disclosure only teaches the following: "In one embodiment, the list of data sources associated with a particular code is obtained by running the corresponding set of queries against various databases available on the World Wide Web (WWW) to identify one or more documents or content links or services that match the query criteria specified in the corresponding queries." Clearly, running queries against databases available on the World Wide Web does *not* equate to checking for services that are available "on" a "local network". Therefore, contrary to that argued in the Office Action, Rappaport does not teach or suggest "checking for services that are available on the local network".

In view of the above, claim 27, and its dependents, are clearly allowable over Martin/Rappaport.

Martin and Rappaport are similarly deficient in relation to independent claim 35. Specifically, for reasons similar to those expressed in the foregoing, neither Martin nor Rappaport teach or suggest "logic configured to query the local network for information about the current environment" or "logic configured to check for services that are available on the local network".

In view of the above, claim 35, and its dependents, are clearly allowable over Martin/Rappaport.

In summary, it is Applicant's position that Martin and Rappaport fail to render Applicant's claims obvious. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Applicant's claims should be withdrawn.

**4. Answers to the Examiner's Arguments Presented in the First  
Advisory Action Dated August 19, 2005**

In the Advisory Action dated August 19, 2005, the Examiner argues that Martin teaches "query[ing] the local network for information about a current environment" and cites column 3, lines 27-34 of the Martin reference. That portion of the reference provides as follows:

As a computer readable medium including computer program code for producing a navigation aid on a web page, another embodiment of the invention includes: computer program code for receiving a request for the web page from a requester; computer program code for determining identity of the requester; computer program code for determining device characteristics of a mobile device used by the requester; computer program code for retrieving menu information associated with the identity of the requester; computer program code for producing the navigation aid based on the menu information and the device characteristics, the navigation aid including a plurality of links to available services, and the navigation aid being in a format suitable for the mobile device; and computer program code for forwarding the web page including the navigation aid to the requestor.

[Martin, column 3, lines 22-36]

As can be appreciated from the above excerpt, Martin does *not* disclose "querying the local network" as is argued by the Examiner. Instead, Martin's system in response to a request for a web page, determines various information about the requestor. *Nothing* in the above excerpt even comes close to suggesting "querying a local network."

In addition, the Examiner argues that Rappaport teaches “checking for service that are available on network” and cites paragraph 23, lines 13-16. Again, that portion of the Rappaport reference provides as follows:

In one embodiment, the database is structured to include a list of codes where each code is used to identify or indicate a particular medical procedure/test. For each code in the list, the database may also contain a list of one or more definitions of the respective code. In one embodiment, the database is used to store a list of data sources identified using the one or more definitions associated with each code. In one embodiment, the database is also configured to store a set of queries associated with each code. The set of queries associated with each code is constructed based upon the one or more definitions corresponding to the respective code. In one embodiment, the list of data sources associated with a particular code is obtained by running the corresponding set of queries against various databases available on the World Wide Web (WWW) to identify one or more documents or content links or services that match the query criteria specified in the corresponding queries. In one embodiment, a selection process is performed to select the list of data sources for the respective code from the documents or content links identified from the various web databases.

[Rappaport, paragraph 0023]

As can be appreciated from the above paragraph, Rappaport only teaches running queries against databases on the World Wide Web. *Nothing* in the excerpt says anything about querying a “local network”.

**B. Rejection of Claims 32, 34, 38, and 40**

Claims 32, 34, 38, and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Rappaport in further view of Corwin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0075812). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As is identified above, Martin and Rappaport fail to teach or suggest explicit limitations of claims 27 and 35. In that Corwin does not remedy this deficiency of the Martin and Rappaport references, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 32, 34, 38, and 40, which depend from claims 27 and 35, are allowable over the Martin/Rappaport/Corwin combination for at least the same reasons that claims 27 and 35 are allowable over Martin/Rappaport.

**C. Rejection of Claims 41-51**

Claims 41-51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frigon (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0103813) in view of Smith (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0006911). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**1. The Frigon Disclosure**

Frigon discloses a method and apparatus for obtaining information relating to the existence of at least one object in an image. Frigon, Patent Application Title. More particularly, Frigon discloses a method and apparatus for enabling identification of objects and the location of those objects in an image. Frigon, paragraph 0002.

Significantly, Frigon says nothing about a service that checks for imaging services that are available on the local network.



## 2. The Smith Disclosure

Smith discloses an interactive advertising system and method. Smith, Patent Application Title. More particularly, Smith discloses a communication system in which multimedia content is provided to a client relative to a characteristic of the client device. Smith, paragraph 0008.

Significantly, Smith also does not teach or suggest a service that checks for imaging services that are available on the local network.

## 3. Applicant's Claims

Applicant's claims recite apparatus and systems that, among other things, check for imaging services that are available on a local network. For example, independent claim 41 provides as follows (emphasis added):

41. A computer, comprising:
- a network browser that is configured to receive network content;
  - a personal imaging repository that is configured to store imaging data; and
  - a thin portal service that is configured to *query a local network to which the computer is connected for information about a current environment, to check for imaging services that are available on the local network* and that are configured to access the imaging data of the personal imaging repository, and to *create web content for the network browser*, the web content including at least one link to an imaging service that is available on the local network.

In the Advisory Action dated August 19, 2005, the Examiner clarifies that the "computer" that the Examiner relies upon from Frigon's disclosure is "computer 100" in Figure 1.

The Examiner argues in the Advisory Action that Frigon's computer 100 includes a network browser *and* a personal image repository. This is untrue. As is clearly shown in Figure 1, "computer 100" is a client computer that includes a browser 105. All databases, however, are provided in server computer 200. Therefore, Frigon's computer does *not* include a network browser and a personal imaging repository.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner also states that the recitation of a "computer" has not been given patentable weight because it appears in the preamble of claim 41. Applicant asserts that such an action is clearly improper. The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) describes how claim preambles are to be treated in Chapter 2100. Specifically, MPEP § 2111.02 states that "If the claim preamble, when read in the context of the entire claim, recites limitations of the claim, or, if the claim preamble is 'necessary to give life, meaning, and vitality' to the claim, then the claim preamble should be construed as if in the balance of the claim." In addition, that section provides that "statements in the preamble reciting the purpose or intended use of the claimed invention must be evaluated to determine whether the recited purpose or intended use results in a structural difference (or, in the case of process claims, manipulative difference) between the claimed invention and the prior art. If so, the recitation serves to limit the claim."

In the present case, Applicant's preamble does in fact "recite a limitation" in the sense of MPEP § 2111.02. Specifically, claim 41 is an apparatus claim that is actually

drawn to "a computer". In other words, "a computer" is the invention that is at issue in claim 41. Accordingly, the preamble does not merely recite a "purpose or intended use."

The Examiner's disregard for the term "computer" in claim 41 appears to be motivated only by the inadequacy of the prior art coupled with a desire to reject the claim anyway. Applicant objects to this treatment of claim 41, and further objects to the fact that the Examiner adopted this position for the first time in the Advisory Action, thereby denying Applicant a full opportunity to respond.

In the Final Office Action dated June 3, 2005, it is acknowledged that Frigon does not teach or suggest querying a local network for information about a current environment, or checking for imaging services that are available on a local network. The Office Action therefore relies upon the Smith reference to account for those limitations. Specifically, the Office Action argues that Smith teaches a "thin portal service" that is configured to "query" and "check for services available the [sic] network" in paragraph 140. Office Action, page 6.

Applicant has reviewed paragraph 140 in Smith and finds no such teachings. That paragraph provides as follows:

[0140] FIG. 12A illustrates the interaction of a client having handheld device 16 with advertising server 22 to facilitate the identification and provision of transit geographic and time of arrival information to the client. First, the client connects to advertising server 22 through a wireless network that includes a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) portal 49. That is, the client uses WAP enabled handheld device 16 to connect to WAP portal 49 using Wireless Session Protocol (WSL) via the cellular communications tower 40. WAP portal 49 returns a "homepage" deck as

determined by the network provider which lists the available services and links. The client is required to select the link to the WAP transportation unit location service. This link would specify the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) of advertising server 22.

Clearly, nothing in the above paragraph teaches a "thin portal device", or any device that is configured to either "query a local network . . . a current environment," or "check for imaging services that are available on the local network and that are configured to access the imaging data of the personal imaging repository". Claim 41, and its dependents, claims 42-49, are allowable over Frigon/Smith for at least the reasons provided above.

Turning to independent claim 50, Frigon/Smith also fail to teach or suggest a system comprising a server including a "thin portal service" that is configured to "check for imaging services that are available on the local network" for reasons described above.

Regarding independent claim 51, Frigon/Smith likewise fail to teach or suggest a system comprising a "thin portal server" that is configured to "check for imaging services that are available on the local network" for reasons described above.

#### **4. Frigon and Smith Not Applicable as "Prior Art" References**

As a further matter, Applicant notes that the Frigon and the Smith applications were published after Applicant's filing date. Accordingly, these applications only comprise "prior art" under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Given that the filing dates of both applications were subsequent to Applicant's filing date, the references can only be properly cited against Applicant's claims *if* the subject matter relied upon by the

Examiner was *also* disclosed in the provisional applications that the applied applications reference.

In the present case, Applicant submits that the teachings upon which the Examiner rely were not adequately disclosed in the provisional applications that the cited applications reference, and that the applications are therefore not properly citable against Applicant's claims. The Examiner, however, did not respond to Applicant's request to explicitly identify where such teachings are disclosed in the provisional applications.

Claims 41-51 are allowable for these additional reasons.

## VII. Conclusion

In summary, it is Applicant's position that Applicant's claims are patentable over the applied prior art references and that the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Appellant therefore respectfully requests that the Board of Appeals overturn the Examiner's rejection and allow Applicant's pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shell S. Simpson et al

By:



Nathan R. Rieth  
Registration No. 44,302

### Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300.

Date of facsimile: 12/2/05

Signature: Chris Guthrie  
Chris Guthrie

**Claims Appendix under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii)**

The following are the claims that are involved in this Appeal.

27. A method for providing links to services that are available on a local network, the method comprising:

receiving a request for web content;  
querying the local network for information about a current environment;  
checking for services that are available on the local network; and  
creating web content for a network browser, the web content including at least one link to a service that is available on the local network.

28. The method of claim 27, wherein receiving a request for web content comprises receiving a request from the network browser.

29. The method of claim 27, wherein the request from the network browser is input by a user of the browser.

30. The method of claim 27, wherein checking for services comprises checking for services that are available on the local network that are configured to access imaging data that belongs to a user of a computer on which the browser is executing.

31. The method of claim 27, wherein checking for services comprises checking for services that are available on the local network that are configured to access imaging data stored in a personal imaging repository of the user.

32. The method of claim 27, wherein checking for services comprises determining whether a web proxy service is available on the local network.

33. The method of claim 27, further comprising determining an active network address of a computer on which the browser is executing.

34. The method of claim 27, further comprising checking for devices that are connected to the local network.

35. A system stored on a computer-readable medium, the system comprising:  
logic configured to query the local network for information about a current environment;

logic configured to check for services that are available on the local network; and  
and logic configured to create web content for a network browser, the web content including at least one link to a service that is available on the local network.

36. The system of claim 35, further comprising logic configured to receive a request for web content from the network browser.



37. The system of claim 35, wherein the logic configured to check for services comprises logic configured to check for services that are configured to access imaging data stored in a personal imaging repository of a user of a computer on which the network browser executes.

38. The system of claim 35, wherein the logic configured to check for services comprises logic configured to check for a web proxy service that is available on the local network.

39. The system of claim 35, further comprising logic configured to determine an active network address of a computer on which the browser is executing.

40. The system of claim 35, further comprising logic configured to check for devices that are connected to the local network.

41. A computer, comprising:  
a network browser that is configured to receive network content;  
a personal imaging repository that is configured to store imaging data; and  
a thin portal service that is configured to query a local network to which the computer is connected for information about a current environment, to check for imaging services that are available on the local network and that are configured to access the imaging data of the personal imaging repository, and to create web content for the

network browser, the web content including at least one link to an imaging service that is available on the local network.

42. The computer of claim 41, wherein the personal imaging repository comprises a composition store that stores imaging compositions and an imaging data store that stores imaging data.

43. The computer of claim 42, wherein the composition store comprises link references to imaging data stored in the imaging data store.

44. The computer of claim 41, further comprising a thin portal reference that identifies the thin portal service.

45. The computer of claim 41, further comprising an extension that provides access to content received by the network browser to the personal imaging repository.

46. The computer of claim 45, wherein the extension comprises part of the network browser.

47. The computer of claim 45, wherein the extension accesses the personal imaging repository by referring to user information stored on the computer.

48. The computer of claim 41, wherein the thin portal service is further configured to check for imaging devices that are available on the local network.

49. The computer of claim 41, wherein the computer is a laptop computer.

50. A system provided on a local network, comprising:

a computer connected to the local network, the computer including a network browser that is configured to receive network content, and a personal imaging repository that is configured to store imaging data; and

a server connected to the local network, the server including a thin portal service that is configured to check for imaging services that are available on the local network and that are configured to access the imaging data of the personal imaging repository, and to create web content for the network browser, the web content including at least one link to an imaging service that is available on the local network.

51. A system provided on a local network, comprising:

a computer connected to the local network, the computer including a network browser that is configured to receive network content;

a storage server connected to the local network, the storage server including a personal imaging repository that is configured to store imaging data; and

a thin portal server connected to the local network, the thin portal server including a thin portal service that is configured to check for imaging services that are available on the local network and that are configured to access the imaging data of the personal

imaging repository, and to create web content for the network browser, the web content including at least one link to an imaging service that is available on the local network.

**Evidence Appendix under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix)**

There is no extrinsic evidence to be considered in this Appeal. Therefore, no evidence is presented in this Appendix.

**Related Proceedings Appendix under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x)**

There are no related proceedings to be considered in this Appeal. Therefore, no such proceedings are identified in this Appendix.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**